

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 7-8 are amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the originally filed application, such as, for example, originally filed Claim 7, Figures 2-3 and paragraph [0020]. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,602,349 to Chandra et al. (Chandra). Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claims 1 and 8 each recite a substrate processing apparatus having an upper lid that includes an electron beam irradiating part disposed in a center thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chandra is totally silent as to such a feature.

Applicants note the feature incorporated into Claims 1 and 8 herein by Amendment was originally recited by Claim 7. With respect to Claim 7, Applicants note the Office Action, in asserting Chandra teaches such a feature, cites Col. 1, lines 23-35 and Col. 7, lines 3-14 of Chandra for supposedly disclosing the feature of the electron beam irradiating part. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion.

Specifically, Applicants note that neither cited passage of Chandra discloses, teaches or otherwise suggests disposing an electron beam irradiating part in a center of the lid (30). In fact, Applicants note that Chandra fails to even disclose an electron beam irradiating part. Rather, what Chandra appears to disclose are a pair of heat

platens 32 and 33, wherein the lower platen 32 is disposed *on top of* the lid 30 with the upper platen 33 disposed opposite the lower platen 32 and the wafer located between the two platens 32 and 33. As shown in Figure 5, a gas 35 then soaks or passes over the wafer before flowing out of the chamber formed by the two platens 32 and 33.

Furthermore, since the wafer is located above the lid 30, Applicants submit there would be no motivation to dispose an electron beam irradiating part in a center of the lid 30 since the lid 30 is located below the wafer. If one of ordinary skill in the art were to incorporate an electron beam irradiating part into the Chandra apparatus, one would more likely incorporate same in the upper platen 33 or similarly disposed portion of the process chamber 10.

As such, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Chandra fails to disclose, teach or otherwise suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 8.

To qualify as prior art, each and every feature of a rejected claim must be disclosed by a cited prior art reference.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature recited by the rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record.

As explained above, Chandra fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Chandra. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 8 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable at least for the same reason(s) Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-8, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107350.00008.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

MO/elp